VIRGINIA
LAW REVIEW

VOL. II. JANUARY, 1914 No. 4

# LEGAL EDUCATION AND ADMISSION TO THE BAR IN THE SOUTHERN STATES.*

## 1. LEGAL EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH.

TAKING up the first branch of our topic—namely, "Legal Education in the South"—if by the term legal education is meant facilities for legal instruction, we have cause to feel encouraged over the progress made in recent years. Prior to 1850, the law school that I have the honor to serve was, I believe, the only law school in the Southern States. There are now thirty of such schools, or an average of two in each State—excluding the District of Columbia from our computation, and including Oklahoma. These thirty schools comprise about one-fourth of all the law schools of the country, with an enrollment of more than three thousand students.

Within the present decade standards of admission have been raised in all of the principal law schools of the South; and from the former one-year curriculum that we of my generation regarded as affording a marvelous amount of legal training, twelve of the Southern schools have increased their courses to three years.

While the progress thus made is not wholly discouraging, the South has yet not kept pace with the spirit of progress exhibited by the law schools in other parts of the country.

Comparisons may be invidious, but they are sometimes interesting. Of eighty-eight law schools not in the South, only five,

*An address delivered before the Kentucky Bar Association in July, 1914.

or less than six per cent, still offer courses of less than three years—and it is significant that four of these five are located in Indiana, whose constitution endows every citizen with the privilege of practicing law without any previous study of it.

Of the thirty law schools in the South, eighteen (or sixty per cent) are still content with a two-years' course or less. That is to say, while only six per cent of the schools outside of the South are still below what we may call the American standard, the percentage rises to sixty per cent in the South.

Getting away now from statistics, which are always tiresome, and assuming without argument that other things being equal the three-year schools offer better training for young men destined for the bar, it may be of interest briefly to consider whether the more extensive course can be justified on educational and economic grounds; and especially to inquire into the reasons for this marked diversity between the standards of the Southern law schools and those outside of the South.

Objection is frequently made, particularly by lawyers who were educated under former conditions, and who have not followed the trend of modern educational policies and methods, that while the more extensive course of necessity affords a more thorough legal training, yet this result is obtained at too great a sacrifice of time and money; and that when accounts are balanced they will disclose a loss rather than a gain. Nor is it easy to convince such lawyers—particularly if they themselves have met with some degree of success at the bar—that the newer ideas in legal education deserve general acceptance. But these questions of higher or lower standards of admission to the law schools, and of longer or shorter courses, have been so thoroughly threshed out in the bar associations of the country—and notably in the American Bar Association—and by the numerous educational and pedagogic associations, that they are regarded in educational circles as no longer open questions. And the experience of the schools that have adopted the higher standards abundantly demonstrates the soundness of that policy.

The most stubborn antagonism to advanced entrance requirements, and to the lengthened courses, and the chief impediment to the elevation of the curricula of the Southern law schools to

what we have termed the American standard, come, in the first instance, from the mistaken assumption on the part of college authorities that the youth of the South are still suffering from the results of a war a half century ago, and are therefore unable to incur the additional expense thus entailed, and the fear that the law schools will, by raising standards, lose patronage. It is sufficient here to say that the South has today many times more young men able and willing to take, and actually taking, collegiate instruction, than at any period in its history. It will become necessary a little later on, to recur to what we may call the poverty plea, in connection with our discussion of standards of admission to the bar. But howsoever ill-founded the assumption, I am persuaded that one potent cause of this holding back on the part of our Southern law schools is the fear of a depleted treasury from a diminished student enrollment.

We of the law faculty at the University of Virginia had to fight this argument for years, first among ourselves then within our general faculty, and finally with our governing board. When timid objectors finally capitulated, the result was a surprise even to the warmest advocates of the measure. Instead of a loss in the number of students, there was at once a marked increase in the attendance, and the school has steadily added to its enrollment every year since.

The same apprehension seems not to have affected the academic courses offered by Southern institutions of learning. These are well abreast of similar institutions in the north and west, both in the character and the extent of their courses. The attainment of the baccalaureate degree in the arts and sciences in the average Southern college requires the same entrance qualifications, the same periods of attendance, and the same amount of work, that are demanded in colleges of corresponding grade in other sections of the country. Nor in medicine, nor engineering, nor dentistry, nor pharmacy, do we find such lines of cleavage between the schools of the South and those elsewhere. It is an anomaly, then, well worthy of serious remark, that the law schools alone have permitted this bogy of Southern poverty and diminished revenues to hold them to the rear in the march of progress which all other branches of education, academical and profes-

sional, have made in the South. No one would assert that this standardizing of the academic, medical and other professional courses, has depopulated our college class rooms. Quite the opposite is true. Our Southern colleges are far more numerous and far more prosperous than ever in the country's history. Every medical school in the country, including those in the South, has increased its course to four years of professional work, and most of them require, in addition, two years of preliminary college work—none, I believe, less than the completion of a high school course—and yet these schools are crowded with students, and are flourishing like green bay trees.

There must, then, be some other contributing cause back of this nightmare of a diminished attendance in Southern law schools to follow in case of high standards. A study of the question has convinced me that the real root of the situation lies in the low standards of admission to the bar prevalent in the Southern States, and—as will be indicated in more detail a little later—standards largely characteristic of the South.

When we discover the conjunction of low standards of admission to the bar, with low standards of entrance to and graduation from law schools in one section, and elsewhere high standards of admission to the bar with correspondingly high standards in the law schools, we can not escape the conclusion that the lower standards of admission to the bar are the real underlying causes of the lower law school standards. Nobody doubts but that the severe regimen which the medical student is required to undergo in obtaining his medical education, is directly due to the severe tests to which the medical schools know he must be subjected, and to the credentials which he must produce, when he applies for admission as a practitioner. In other words, the medical schools are supplying the qualifications demanded by the medical boards of examiners.

The typical student has a supreme distaste for works of supererogation. I speak as a teacher of long experience. What the average student craves is the prestige of a degree from his chosen college, and he will resort to any short cut by which he may honorably secure it. It is the degree, and not what it stands for, that interests him most. The popular college courses

are those that require least work. The studies of Latin and Greek, supposed in your college days and mine to be the foundation of a college education, are now in eclipse where no longer required for the baccalaureate degree. So, the average youth destined for the bar, himself ignorant of the qualifications his new career demands, is content with that equipment which will enable him, with least delay and least exertion, to satisfy the test prescribed by the bar examiners. The non-standard courses in Southern law schools are, therefore, in direct response to the standards of admission prevailing in the Southern States. As in the case of the medical schools, the law schools are simply supplying the demand created by the examining boards, or the statutes under which the examiners exercise their functions.

That this is the real explanation of the anomalous situation will, I think, be made plainer in the discussion of the second branch of our topic, which we are now approaching.

Before passing, however, from the subject of legal education, it may be proper to say a word with reference to the contest long waged between the advocates of the text-book and lecture system of teaching, on the one side, and of the case system on the other. I do not propose here to discuss the merits of that controversy. Personally, I prefer and therefore use the former method—possibly because I know that system better. Most of my colleagues in the law school agree in my view. We are quite satisfied with the results we obtain from it. Each undoubtedly has its peculiar merits. And since the text-book schools have begun freely to use the case book along with the text—as we do at Virginia—and the case-book schools to assign the text-books as parallel reading—texts either ready made or in the form of elaborate notes by the instructor—along with the cases, it looks as if a truce between the warring elements were in sight.

We have now come to the second branch of our topic, namely:

## 2. Requirements for Admission to the Bar.

Here the contrast between the situation in the South and that elsewhere in the United States is even less pleasing than that

already presented between the law schools of the respective sections.

It is not easy to arrive at what we may call an American standard for admission to the bar, as it is actually enforced. In this particular, each State has in large measure been a law unto itself. But for our present purpose a fairly accurate statement of this American standard—excluding the Southern States from the account—is that for which the American Bar Association has stood for many years, namely, that the candidate shall have completed an academic course equivalent at least to that of a four-year high school, and shall have studied law in a law school, or under competent private instruction, properly certified to, for at least three years before he is admitted to the bar examination. Thus is secured presumptive evidence of a fairly adequate preliminary education, and, presumptively again, in addition to the more or less meagre test of the bar examination, some assurance of the breadth and accuracy of the candidate's knowledge of legal principles, and his ability to serve his clients as a conscientious and efficient practitioner.

It will be observed that this standard considers, not the nature of the bar examination itself, but the qualifications which the candidate shall possess in order to be admitted to the examination. And in my judgment the insistence upon this antecedent preparation strikes at the heart of the evil of our system in the South, where we make no such provision for automatically winnowing out the presumptively unfit by debarring them from the examination. With us the doors of the examination rooms are left wide open, and the burden of separating the chaff from the wheat is left solely to the examining committee. The consequence is that upon the personal equation of the members of the committee, at any particular time or place, depends the nature of the test applied. The tap-root of the present evil will be cut only when we eliminate this uncontrolled discretion now exercised by examining committees.

Doubtless the practical question with those of you who are in sympathy with the reform movement is—as with us in Virginia—not what standards of admission to the bar you would

like to have adopted, but what standards you can hope to have adopted.

If you favor reform in present standards and methods, you will doubtless endeavor to make haste slowly. You can scarcely hope to reach your ideal at a single bound. Your bar and your legislature, after long wandering in the twilight, will need to be led slowly into the open day.

But what I desire especially to urge upon you is that the seat of the present evil in our Southern systems is in the absolute and uncontrolled discretion vested in the examiners. I am sure that your judges and their assisting committees, to whom you have confided this great trust in Kentucky, would be glad to have their responsibility shared or lessened by reformed methods. Whatever, then, your recommendations as to the character of the examinations, you should see to it that the doors of your examination rooms are not open to all who apply. You should adopt some definite and specific test of the candidate's antecedent educational experience—academical and professional —or professional only, if that seems wise at the beginning—and require every candidate to present evidence of this experience, properly certified by his school, or college, or instructor, as a condition of his admission to the examination.

How far you shall attempt to go in this direction, is a question which you who are more familiar with local conditions must decide. But I venture the hope that you will not be content to stop short of at least the minimum standard of the American Bar Association to which your attention has just been called.

In at least twenty-five States the three-year period of legal instruction is demanded as an essential qualification to admission to the bar examination—Louisiana being the only Southern State represented in this group—and in twenty-two States a preliminary education equivalent to the completion of a high school course is required. In this latter group of twenty-two the South is represented by the two States of South Carolina and Oklahoma. Of twelve States of the Union in which no provision for credentials as to previous legal instruction, nine are Southern States—in companionship with Utah, Nevada and Indiana—the last, that prolific mother of lawyers, from whose

fertile womb they are born ready-made. Again, of the fifteen Southern States, thirteen exact no prescribed credentials as to the candidate's preliminary academic training, and in Oklahoma alone of the Southern States must the candidate furnish certificates of both academic and professional training as a condition precedent to standing the examination. In a few of these States, it is true, candidates are required to State in their applications the extent of their legal browsing—or to certify that they have "read"—or, as in North Carolina, "perused"—save the mark!—certain named books. But these provisions have the vice of all rules that operate merely *in terrorem*. It is a far cry from "reading" law, and "perusing" text-books, to studying law in a law school, or even under private instruction.

It is painfully obvious, therefore, that in the matter of standards of admission to the bar, we of the South are far in the rear of the procession of the States toward higher professional ideals. A certificate of moral character—to be had for the asking—and ability, under the spur of a clever coach, or by digging over former question papers, to cram enough legal rules to pass the all-too-easy bar examinations—held, perhaps, by a few delightful gentlemen who are bubbling over with sympathy for the candidates—seem to sum up the prevailing professional view of the qualifications that our Southern youth should possess in order to enter upon the practice of the law.

It grieves me to have to confess that my own home State of Virginia, and to remind you that your own great State of Kentucky, are among the thirteen that require no other test of candidates for admission than that which the examiners may see fit to apply. It is due, however, to the examining board in Virginia to say that the gentlemen who at present compose that board are in sympathy with high standards, and are conscientiously trying, by the rigor of their examinations, to make some amends for the laxity of our legislation. In an examination held within the last few weeks these brave guardians rejected fifty candidates out of a class of one hundred and twenty-five.

I am aware that there is within the legal profession itself a very considerable element that favors these low standards, and that honestly believes that Kentucky and Virginia and their

Southern sisters deserve commendation for thus making easy the way of the candidate for admission to the bar. It is argued that high standards exclude worthy candidates who are unable, for financial reasons, to obtain either an academic or a professional education. And the argument is clinched by the assertion that if an unqualified candidate does slip through the wide-open gate, the public will soon take his measure, and the lack of business will eliminate him from the profession. A third argument is, that in order to qualify one to begin the practice of the law, neither academical nor professional training, beyond knowledge of a few rudiments, is essential—and history is quoted for examples of rail-splitters and tailors who by their own mother-wit have attained eminence in the profession, and the highest national honors.

All of these are stock arguments, and the especial favorites of those lawyers who have reached mediocrity in the profession in spite of early poverty and the lack of preliminary training. The advocates of these views are always in evidence in every body of lawyers or legislators when a movement is made to raise the standards of admission, and these arguments are notably potent when addressed by lawyers themselves to the non-professional legislator. While the doctors, dentists, pharmacists, and even the undertakers and the plumbers, stand together in demanding legislation to secure higher standards of fitness in their several callings—and succeed in their demands, *because* they stand together—we find our efforts in the same direction opposed and thwarted from within our own ranks. Indeed, as pointed out in a recent report of the Carnegie Foundation, low standards of admission to the bar are in no inconsiderable degree due to the members of the legal profession in the legislatures, who oppose standards higher than those they themselves could have fulfilled at the beginning of their professional career.

Taking up these arguments in order, and as briefly as I may, it is not true in fact that high standards will exclude from the profession any young man who has in him the stuff out of which the successful practitioner is made. These standards will exclude, and are meant to exclude, the indifferent material that is now crowding into the profession because the road is easy,

while that into the other professions is long and weary—material that discredits the legal profession, and is a daily embarrassment to the courts in the orderly administration of justice. It is largely from this class that the unethical practitioner, the trickster and the shyster are bred.

But no reasonable standard can shut out the young man of the calibre that the bar demands. The more severe the test the greater his ambition to prepare himself for it. With free tuition offered by the State, from the primary school through the baccalaureate degree in the State university—with the numerous endowed scholarships and loan funds available in our higher institutions of learning—and with the many opportunities presented for working his way through college while pursuing his academic or professional course, no young man of character and force needs in these days be debarred the privileges of a first-class education. I speak as a college professor of more than twenty years' experience. During this time a large number of the finest of the many fine young fellows under my tuition have been such men, and in the class I have been describing.

By lowering our standards in mistaken zeal for the impecunious youth whose ambition leads him into the law without endowing him with the necessary energy and will power to find means of self-equipment, we must not forget the harm thus done to that large class whose financial means are not cramped, but who from indolence or indifference, and following the lines of least resistance, prematurely enter upon the practice. Like young plants too soon removed from the parent bed, their growth is stunted, and they fail to reach their full maturity. In other words, low standards are holding out false lights to our unwary and ill-advised youth, and betraying them into a profession which they can never hope to adorn.

Our brothers of the medical profession, in every State of the Union, have recognized the unsoundness of this poverty argument, and have had the courage to ignore it in fixing their standards of admission. Graduation from an approved medical school, with a four-years' curriculum, is a *sine qua non* of admission to the profession of medicine; and to get into the med-

ical schools of the better grade, two years of antecedent college work are required. And yet our Southern youth are crowding the halls of these schools, and later, as educated, ethical and scientific physicians, are bringing to the people in every vale and hamlet of the country a new gospel of health.

The second argument, that the State owes no duty to the public to protect it against the mistakes or the chicanery of an incompetent lawyer—that the public will look out for itself, without the intervention of the State, and that the lack of clients will drive the incompetent from the profession without harm done—is even less plausible.

If the unorganized public may be depended upon to eliminate the unfit lawyer, the same consideration would eliminate the incompetent man of medicine, the careless or unscrupulous druggist, the unsanitary or dishonest dairyman, the shortweight coal and ice-dealer and demand the repeal of all pure food and inspection laws. But the State recognizes the indifference and helplessness of the ordinary citizen in protecting himself against the incompetence and the dishonesty of those who serve the public in other callings, and itself assumes this duty, so far as legislation can accomplish it. It is worth inquiry, then, why the legal profession alone should be exempt from this wise guardianship, and why the public should be presumed to be on the *qui vive,* and alert for its own interests, only when dealing with members of this profession. The man of law who advances this argument should be classed with the bird that fouls its own nest.

Nor should we forget, in this connection, that the State owes a higher duty to its courts to see that justice is not hindered nor denied by reason of the incompetence of those who are necessary parts of its judicial machinery. And if there is one prime source of public solicitude during the sessions of our State legislatures, and of that sigh of relief that we instinctively breathe when our legislatures adjourn, it is the presence there of the bigoted and narrow-minded lawyer, with just enough of learning to make him dangerous.

The third argument is that, after all, little training is needed to qualify one for the law, as shown by the circumstance that this country has produced many excellent lawyers who came to the bar with meager equipment.

Nobody denies the last assertion. So ships have reached their destined ports without their proper complement of crew or coal. These men became great lawyers, not because of their meager initial equipment, but in spite of it. The applause that the world accords to one who has succeeded under such conditions, indicates that he has done something exceptional. The self-educated and the self-made man is a departure from the type. In fixing our professional standards we must provide for the general and not the particular—for the average and not the exceptional. The judge or legislator who has regard to the individual and not to the mass, is disloyal to his trust. It is so in nature. She ruthlessly sacrifices the individual but is the fostering mother of the race. "The individual withers and the world is more and more."

Finally, if higher standards of education do not tend to produce a higher professional type—with superior ideals and greater professional efficiency—then the marvelous educational activities of our modern civilization are based on a fallacy; our whole educational system is a failure; and we might as well tear down the little red schoolhouse on the hill.

This matter of academic preparation as preliminary to the study of the law has been very interesting to me as a teacher. Since my connection with the law school of the University of Virginia, radical changes have been made in the entrance requirements. While these were non-existent, or easily met, the school was crowded with ill-prepared and unripe material, whose progress was slow, painful and unsatisfactory. There was a lack of snap and vigor, and that keen professional curiosity so essential to professional progress. The low standard of admission into the law school had precisely the same effect on student material as similar standards of admission to the bar have on the *esprit de corps* of the bar. Youths meant for the bar, knowing that the way into the law school was an easy one,

lacked the incentive to prepare themselves in their academic studies. Attracted by the freedom of college life, and ambitious for little else than to escape from the swaddling bands of the high school and assume the toga of the college man, large numbers of unfledged youths, with their high school work incomplete, were accustomed to invade the halls of the law school, and with disastrous consequences to themselves. There was an annual slaughter of the innocents, to the right and to the left. We finally realized that we were doing as foolish a thing as the farmer who gathers his crops in unripe state. And so we changed our policy, and refused to admit any candidate for graduation before he had at least completed his high school work. Since this regulation became effective, lads destined for the law school, knowing that they can not enter without the required passport, are incited to diligence and perseverance in their preliminary high school studies. Success in these tends to encourage them to aspire to an academic degree before entering upon their legal studies, and many of them pursue their academic work thus far. The result has brought us not only a larger enrollment, but a student constituency of incomparably superior quality. If you gentlemen of the bar could see for yourselves, as I do from day to day in the class room, and from term to term in the examinations, the marked difference between those law students who come into the school with first-rate preliminary training, and those who are less well prepared, no further argument would be needed to convince you of the truth that I am endeavoring to bring home to you, namely, that to encourage or to permit undisciplined recruits to enter the legal profession, is not only a wrong to the profession, but a greater injustice to the deluded victims of our mistaken generosity.

I might well have called attention to the tremendous growth of the law within comparatively recent years, and to its promise of future growth, and to the largely increased demands which this expanding jurisprudence has made, and will continue to make, upon the resources of the members of our profession who must be its interpreters and guides. This gigantic expansion has long since quieted the old debate between the advocates of law-school instruction and those who believe that office instruc-

tion afforded the better training—and in favor of the law school. But these considerations are too obvious for enlarged comment, and my address is already extending itself beyond reasonable limits.

I have already more than once referred to the progress that our medical brethren have made and are making—not only in educational lines, but in actual advancement of medical and surgical science and its allied branches. I am aware that I am addressing a legal and not a medical body, but I pray you to bear with me while I make one more perhaps invidious comparison.

For probably the first time in its history the profession of law finds its primacy among the secular vocations challenged by a rival—a rival whose marvelous achievements even within the life of this young century, place it easily in the front rank of the learned professions.

Only within recent years has the knowledge of disease, its cause, prevention and cure, reached that stage of development when medical learning might be denominated a science. Almost at a single bound it has leapt from the jungles of empiricism into the society of the wise ones of the earth. It is in the full vigor of its youth—lusty as an eagle, and rejoicing as a strong man to run a race. With an aspiration to accomplish its noble ends, as keen as that of the Crusaders to possess the Holy Sepulcher, the disciples of this new profession are advancing to their conquest with swiftness and confidence. It wars not on man, but man's afflictions; and as if by a wizard's touch, the plague-infested places of the earth become the safe habitations of men.

It is but now that the State has regarded our medical brethren as worthy of its official notice. Thirty years ago no license was required to practise the healing art, and any quack might without challenge assume the title of doctor of medicine, and serve any patient rash enough to employ him.

On the other hand, we men of the law have long been accustomed to occupy the center of the stage, and to stand covered in the presence of royalty. For centuries the State has dignified our profession by efforts, in some form or other, against entry

of the unworthy into it. When diseases were ascribed to the anger of the gods, and were only to be escaped or cured by supernatural intervention—when pestilences were stayed by human sacrifices, and the incantations of witchcraft were potent safeguards against disease and death—human law had already reached a high state of development. We may well boast our claims of long descent. The blood of the Veres de Veres is in our veins, and the records of our house are preserved in a literature extending from the Year Books to the latest volume of the reports.

But pride of ancestry and the prowess of our fathers will not make sure our title to precedence over these sturdy and aggressive contestants, fresh from the wilderness. We must take lessons from them, and profit by their methods.

What our predecessors have done for us, these men of medicine have done for themselves. Their profession owes little to the civilization of the past, and little to its own literature of a century ago. To speak of a medical classic is almost a solecism. They have discarded most of the learning of their fathers as empirical or apocryphal, and have recreated it into a science.

It is scarcely necessary to suggest that this tremendous development in medical and surgical science has not been the result of accident or of magic, except in so far as the zeal for advanced educational standards with which its leaders have impressed the rank and file of the profession may suggest the magical. This progress is due directly to the character of the highly trained men who make up that profession. To recruit their ranks only from among those whose preliminary training gives opportunity and promise of future efficiency, and by the adoption and enforcement of rigid regulations which exclude the untrained, the immature and the constitutionally incompetent—not to rely on the uncontrolled discretion of any board of examiners, but to control that discretion by stringent regulations as to credentials which the candidates must present—is the spirit that pervades the whole medical profession. They are carrying out this policy aggressively and courageously, by constantly raising the standards of admission to their educational institutions, and through these to their profession. As the result of this propaganda for

thoroughly trained men, as has before been indicated, their standards have already reached a limit which we can not hope to attain in this generation.

I would be uncandid to advocate, for the immediate future, so severe a regimen for candidates for admission to the bar. But surely the two sciences of medicine and law are not so widely apart in the difficulties they present, respectively, that while six years of college work are required to master the one, a sufficient mastery of the other may be acquired in a few months, by private study, and with no college training whatsoever, academical or professional.

There was a time in the South, still fresh within the memory of many of us, when conditions justified the present attitude of the legal profession on this question. But these conditions have long since ceased, although in that overstrained conservatism characteristic of lawyers we seem not to be conscious of the new order.

Our fathers who had followed that great Virginian through the weary years of the Civil War—who returned to their devastated homes, defeated but not conquered—had already acquired their preliminary training. They had learned their lessons of faithfulness to duty, of patience under suffering, of courage under discouragement, of public service without reward—not in the quiet of academic halls, but in the clash of arms and the thunder of the guns. Their records were passports into any profession to which their inclinations led. And in their subsequent careers—whether in the law or in medicine, in the pulpit or in the legislative halls of the State and nation, or whether in following their Matchless Leader into the academic shades as educators of Southern youth, right nobly did they vindicate our confidence in their fitness. So in the years that followed, when all of our energies were bent upon the rebuilding of our waste places, and it was vital that our youth just attaining to man's estate should become breadwinners without delay, it was wise that the doors of all the professions should be left wide open for them.

But happily "the old order changeth, giving place to new."

The South has come into her own again. Her fields again are ripe with the harvest; the products of her mills, and her mines, and her forests, are on every sea. The nation has called her back to its chief magistracy, and to preside in the highest place upon her highest court. She directs the nation's navy and the nation's mails. The national treasury is in her keeping, and her sons dominate the legislation of the national congress.

With the educational facilities now afforded to our Southern youth, the well-worn arguments for short cuts to a professional life have lost their edge. We owe it to our sons and to our neighbors' sons to hold up to them a standard that will incite them to their highest efforts—and a standard which, if they are incapable of reaching, will mercifully exclude them at the threshold of the profession, and divert them to vocations for which they are better fitted.

*W. M. Lile.*

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA.